REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention allegedly is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 12-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention allegedly is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Lawrence (US 7,181,428) in view of Lawrence (US 2003/0177087) (hereinafter Lawrence '087). Claims have been amended and allowance of all pending claims is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention allegedly is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner has rejected the system claims of claim 1-11 asserting that in spite of the language used within the claims themselves that the claimed invention is a software per se claim that is not statutory under § 101. The Applicant respectfully maintains that the Examiner is construing the claim language in a manner that is inconsistent with the English language and most, if not all, prior decisions in which claim language for computer implemented inventions are interpreted. In spite of this fact, the Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite that the invention is a computing system that executes software to implement the claimed method in an attempt to further prosecution.

Claims 12-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention allegedly is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner has rejected the system claims of claim 12-23 asserting that in spite of the language used within the claims themselves that the claimed invention is a software per se claim that is not statutory under § 101. The Applicant respectfully maintains that the Examiner is construing the claim language in a manner that is inconsistent with the English language and most, if not all, prior decisions in which claim language for computer implemented inventions are interpreted. In spite of this fact, the Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite that the invention

is a computing system that executes software to implement the claimed method in an attempt to further prosecution.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner has rejected the system claims of claim 1-23 asserting that in spite of the language used within the claims themselves that the claimed invention is a software per se claim that is not statutory under § 101. The Applicant respectfully maintains that the Examiner is construing the claim language in a manner that is inconsistent with the English language and most, if not all, prior decisions in which claim language for computer implemented inventions are interpreted. In spite of this fact, the Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite that the invention is a computing system that executes software to implement the claimed method in an attempt to further prosecution.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over <u>Lawrence</u> (US 7,181,428) in view of <u>Lawrence</u> (US 2003/0177087) (hereinafter <u>Lawrence '087</u>). The Examiner's rejection is based on alleged anticipation by <u>Lawrence</u> that addresses the question of how to discover potential political risks to a politically identified person from a host of potential events and activities. However, the instant application is addressing the discovery of potential money laundering financial transactions performed by a branch of a financial institution.

The Applicants have amended the claims to more accurately recite the present invention relating to a system and method for identifying potential money laundering activities within a set of financial transactions.

Accordingly, the claims have been modified to clarify that these claims apply to discovering financial irregularities in financial processing situations, and do so in a manner that cannot be confused with or read on the method and system that <u>Lawrence</u> teaches to discover potential political risks to a politically identified person from a host of potential events and activities. As such, <u>Lawrence</u> fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of

independent claims 1 and 12 as amended in as much as it fails to teach or suggest identifying financial transactions related to money laundering as recited therein. Claims 1 and 12 are now patentable over the prior art of record.

For similar reasoning, claims 2-10 and 13-23, which depend from independent claims 1 and 12 respectively, are also patentable over the prior art of record. None of the other prior art of record remedies the deficiencies of <u>Lawrence</u> as discussed above. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully maintain that the present application is now in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on all these considerations and amendment, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is again urged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully Submitted,

Elazar Katz, *et al.*

By their attorneys,

UNISYS CORPORATION
Unisys Way, MS/E8-114
Blue Bell, PA 19424
(215) 986-3325

Date: <u>17 March 2009</u>   By   /Richard J. Gregson/
                                             Richard J. Gregson
                                             Reg. No. 41,804